

Foreign Agricultural Service

Global Agriculture Information Network

Required Report - public distribution

Date: 5/18/2001

GAIN Report #RS1014

Russian Federation

Sugar

Annual

2001

Approved by:

Geoffrey W. Wiggin U.S. Embassy, Moscow

Prepared by:

Michael Smith and Mikhail Maximenko

Report Highlights:

During the 2000/2001 marketing year, Russia imposed a sugar import tariff-rate quota regime in an effort to protect domestic producers and to raise revenues. However, as a result of the high tariff-rate quota auction prices and low world sugar prices, imports outside of the tariff-rate quota regime remain competitive, and Russia continues to import large volumes of raw cane sugar. Huge sugar stocks and low seasonal demand are beginning to negatively influence prices.

Includes PSD changes: Yes Includes Trade Matrix: Yes Annual Report Moscow [RS1], RS

1

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | |

GAIN Report #RS1014

| oduction |
|--------------------------------|
| nsumption |
| ade |
| Imports |
| ocks |
| licy |
| Import Quota |
| Increase in White Sugar Tariff |
| arketing |

GAIN Report #RS1014 Page 1 of 9

Executive Summary

Total production of sugar beets in Russia declined despite efforts to protect the domestic industry. Both total area planted and total area harvested declined during the 2000/2001 marketing year. Russia continued to import large volumes of raw sugar cane beyond the 3.65 million MT limit imposed by the tariff rate quota regime. White sugar imports also increased significantly. In response to anticipated shortages of raw sugar for processing and the high price of purchasing sugar import lots, sugar prices rose significantly during CY 2000. However, large stocks of sugar remain in Russia, as prices are declining in response to low seasonal demand.

Production

During the 2000/2001 marketing year, both the Government of Russia (GOR) and the sugar beet producers' lobby continued to develop policies to protect the domestic industry. Federal and regional governments provided support to purchase inputs for planting, fertilizers, and harvesting materials. However, while the areas planted and harvested were expected to increase for the second consecutive year, Russian sugar beet acreage was only 810,000 hectares in 2000/2001 or 10 percent less than in 1999/2000. Weather during the sugar beet harvesting season beginning in autumn 2000 was unfavorable and loses were high. During 2000/2001, 14.8 million MT of sugar beets were harvested, in comparison to 15.2 million tons during the previous season.

Almost all sugar beet output was from large farms (95 percent).

Despite the reduced 2000/2001 sugar beet harvest of only 14.8 million MT, production of sugar reached 1.55 million MT. This exceeded the prior year's sugar production by three percent, as efficiency in extracting sugar increased.

Table 1: Russian Sugar Beet Production 1999 - 2000

| Commodity | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 1996 - 2000 Average |
|---------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|------------------------|
| Sugar beet hectares planted | 820,000 | 900,000 | 811,000 | 903,000 |
| Sugar beet harvest, million MT | 11 | 15 | 14 | 14 |
| Sugar beet yield, MT/hectare | 13 | 19 | 19 | 18 |

Source: Russian State Statistic Committee

GAIN Report #RS1014 Page 2 of 9

| PSD Table | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------|---------|-------|---------|-----|---------|
| Country: | | | | | | |
| Commodity: | Sugar Beets | | | | | |
| | | 2000 | | 2001 | | 2002 |
| | Old | New | Old | New | Old | New |
| Market Year Begin | | 10/1999 | | 10/2000 | | 10/2001 |
| Area Planted | 900 | 900 | 1000 | 900 | 0 | 1000 |
| Area Harvested | 850 | 850 | 930 | 810 | 0 | 950 |
| Production | 15600 | 15600 | 15500 | 14800 | 0 | 16000 |
| TOTAL SUPPLY | 15600 | 15600 | 15500 | 14800 | 0 | 16000 |
| Utilization for Sugar | 15600 | 15600 | 15500 | 14800 | 0 | 16000 |
| Utilization for Alcohol | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL UTILIZATION | 15600 | 15600 | 15500 | 14800 | 0 | 16000 |

| PSD Table | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------|---------|------|---------|-----|---------|
| Country: | Russian Federation | | | | | |
| Commodity: | Sugar | | | | | |
| | | 2000 | | 2001 | | 2002 |
| | Old | New | Old | New | Old | New |
| Market Year Begin | | 10/1999 | | 10/2000 | | 10/2001 |
| Beginning Stocks | 2650 | 2650 | 3000 | 3000 | 0 | 2500 |
| Beet Sugar Production | 1500 | 1500 | 1520 | 1550 | 0 | 1600 |
| Cane Sugar Production | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL Sugar Production | 1500 | 1500 | 1520 | 1550 | 0 | 1600 |
| Raw Imports | 5000 | 5000 | 3650 | 3650 | 0 | 3800 |
| Refined Imp.(Raw Val) | 170 | 170 | 170 | 200 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL Imports | 5170 | 5170 | 3820 | 3850 | 0 | 3800 |
| TOTAL SUPPLY | 9320 | 9320 | 8340 | 8400 | 0 | 7900 |
| Raw Exports | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| Refined Exp.(Raw Val) | 180 | 180 | 220 | 220 | 0 | 220 |
| TOTAL EXPORTS | 190 | 190 | 230 | 230 | 0 | 230 |
| Human Dom. Consumption | 6130 | 6130 | 5610 | 5670 | 0 | 5800 |
| Feed Dom. Consumption | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL Dom. Consumption | 6130 | 6130 | 5610 | 5670 | 0 | 5800 |
| Ending Stocks | 3000 | 3000 | 2500 | 2500 | 0 | 1870 |
| TOTAL DISTRIBUTION | 9320 | 9320 | 8340 | 8400 | 0 | 7900 |

Table 2: Types of Sugar Beet Farms in Russia

GAIN Report #RS1014 Page 3 of 9

| | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 |
|----------------------------------|------|------|------|
| Sugar beets, 1,000 Hectares | 820 | 900 | 810 |
| Percent of Total Number of Farms | | | |
| Total | N.A. | 100 | 100 |
| Large Farms (commercial) | N.A. | 94 | 95 |
| Small Farms (commercial) | N.A. | 5 | 4 |
| Private Plots (individual farms) | N.A. | 1 | 1 |

Source: Russian State Statistic Committee

Consumption

Since marketing year 1999/2000, as sugar production increased in Russia, so has total domestic consumption. According to a survey conducted by the Russian firm Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU), international companies believe that agricultural production is among the profitable businesses in Russia - with average profits between 25 to 50 percent. According to data from the Russian Sugar Union, the minimum production cost of sugar from sugar beets equals about \$330 per ton, while the average wholesale price for processed sugar is about \$440 per MT. Currently, there is a significant increase in the number of foreign companies investing in Russia's food industries.

Table 3: Russian Food Production, 1997 - 2000 CY

| Commodity | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 |
|---|------|------|------|-------|
| Sugar 1,000 MT | 3.8 | 4.1 | 6.5 | 6.1 |
| including from sugar beets | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Candy, 1,000 MT | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.6 |
| including containing sugar | 730 | 679 | 700 | N.D. |
| Canned fruits and vegetables millions of cans | N.D. | 849 | 965 | 1,540 |
| Soft drinks, million deciliters | N.D. | 215 | 189 | 222 |

Source: Russian State Statistic Committee

GAIN Report #RS1014 Page 4 of 9

Trade

The Impact of the Quota System

Large volumes of white sugar cane were imported during the period of low seasonal tariffs from December 16th to December 31st, 2000. In addition, significant amounts of outside-quota imports during marketing year 2000/2001 invalidated the anticipated reduction that seasonal duties and a tariff rate quota system were expected to have on imports (See Gain Report RS0060). High auction prices for the right to import raw cane sugar within the 3.65 million MT import quota resulted in a difficult situation for sugar quota recipients, as seasonal tariffs did not cut-off raw sugar imports. Massive import volumes precipitated a fall in sugar prices from about \$447 per MT in March to about \$399 MT in April 2001, according to the Russian magazine "Marketing" (April 2001). Major importers continued to import raw sugar outside the quota, as low world prices and a slumping Euro (which is the currency unit for accessing tariffs in Russia) made it profitable to do so.

According to Minister of Agriculture Gordeev, the tariff rate quota is an appropriate instrument to "balance" the Russian sugar market, but the mechanism needs to be improved. The quota failed to accomplish its goal of bringing "balance" in the market between domestic sugar beets and imported raw sugar cane for several reasons: 1) the high prices of in-quota import lots sold at public auction; 2) the low exchange rate of the Euro; and 3) a fall in world sugar prices. These factors combined and precipitated a sharp reduction in advantages that quota buyers expected to exercise over non-quota buyers. As a result, large amounts of raw sugar continue to be imported despite the quota. According to Yurii Mikhailov, Head of the Sugar Producers Union, "the main task today is to stabilize sugar prices." Currently, the "Union" is seeking to increase the specific component of the customs tariff for out-of-quota raw sugar cane. In addition, they believe that seasonal tariffs will limit imports of sugar and protect local sugar beet producers. The GOR has not yet determined specifically which measures will be applied during the 2001/2002 marketing year.

As a result of the raw cane sugar import quota, there is also a disproportionate distribution of sugar among domestic sugar refineries. Quota owners are attempting to control the market by delivering imported raw sugar only to their own processing factories. In this way, they are attempting to influence domestic prices by dictating the supply of sugar within the market. Consequently, there is a lot of idle sugar processing capacity in Russia.

GAIN Report #RS1014 Page 5 of 9

Imports

Table 4: Russian Raw Sugar Trade, by Quarters, 1998-2000

| HSC 170111 | | 19 | 98 | 19 | 99 | 20 | 000 |
|------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| _ | | MT | \$1,000 | MT | \$1,000 | MT | \$1,000 |
| Total | QIV | 336231 | 112062 | 25788 | 5959 | 648432 | 109248 |
| | QI | 1112850 | 357735 | 1248598 | 295562 | 1584380 | 246138 |
| | QII | 1832204 | 528568 | 2690711 | 514417 | 2235950 | 335470 |
| | QIII | 700501 | 189867 | 1174830 | 210356 | 9996 | 2319 |
| | Total | 3981786 | 1188232 | 5139927 | 1026294 | 4478758 | 693175 |
| Including: | | | | | | | |
| Cuba | QIV | 132 | 49 | N.D. | N.D. | N.D. | N.D. |
| | QI | 250260 | 76630 | 358222 | 85805 | 412148 | 61611 |
| | QII | 1135690 | 320964 | 1312269 | 250701 | 1615727 | 238848 |
| | QIII | 118873 | 30242 | 152507 | 26827 | N.D. | N.D. |
| | Total | 1504955 | 427885 | 1822998 | 363333 | 2027875 | 300459 |
| Brasil | QIV | 285426 | 94545 | 25189 | 5798 | 631432 | 105790 |
| | QI | 733333 | 238653 | 829773 | 194151 | 1010744 | 159717 |
| | QII | 236120 | 70202 | 795023 | 156859 | 208787 | 31580 |
| | QIII | 398600 | 106952 | 705425 | 125630 | 9,996 | 2,319 |
| | Total | 1653479 | 510352 | 2355410 | 482438 | 1860959 | 299406 |

Source: Russian State Custom Committee

GAIN Report #RS1014 Page 6 of 9

Table 5. Russian Trade by White Sugar, by Quarters, 1998, 1999, and 2000, Marketing Year

| Table 5. Russi | an Traue by | y white Bugan | i, by Quarters | , 1770, 1777, | anu 2000, Ma | rketing rear | | | |
|----------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|---------|--|--|
| 1701.99.100 | | 19 | 98 | 19 | 99 | 20 | 000 | | |
| White sugar | | MT | \$1,000 | MT | \$1,000 | MT | \$1,000 | | |
| | QIV | 104339 | 35057 | 41674 | 12822 | 11008 | 2901 | | |
| 1997 | QI | 156371 | 52348 | 83294 | 23932 | 15713 | 3857 | | |
| | QII | 115922 | 37788 | 18159 | 5237 | 48198 | 19296 | | |
| | QIII | 67924 | 21642 | 12922 | 3605 | 12830 | 4443 | | |
| | Total | 444556 | 146835 | 156049 | 45596 | 87749 | 30497 | | |
| Including | | | | | | | | | |
| Poland | QIV | 15238 | 5092 | 8008 | 1967 | 10065 | 2496 | | |
| | QI | 40722 | 13187 | 15843 | 4065 | 9734 | 2230 | | |
| | QII | 17070 | 5595 | 10644 | 2444 | 14045 | 3990 | | |
| | QIII | 9723 | 3139 | 7957 | 2102 | 9918 | 3287 | | |
| | Total | 82753 | 27013 | 42452 | 10578 | 43762 | 12003 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| France | QIV | 5697 | 1858 | 19 | 13 | 60 | 39 | | |
| | QI | 26101 | 8730 | 84 | 29 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | QII | 24692 | 7905 | 100 | 37 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | QIII | 11622 | 3599 | N.D. | N.D. | 60 | 39 | | |
| | Total | 68112 | 22092 | 203 | 79 | 120 | 78 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Ukraine | QIV | 19199 | 6174 | 22924 | 7690 | ND | N.D. | | |
| | QI | 16499 | 6435 | 58697 | 17228 | N.D. | N.D. | | |
| | QII | 5184 | 2224 | 3482 | 1036 | N.D. | N.D. | | |
| | QIII | 725 | 360 | 145 | 56 | N.D. | N.D. | | |
| | Total | 41607 | 15193 | 85248 | 26010 | 0 | 0 | | |

Source: Russian State Custom Committee

GAIN Report #RS1014 Page 7 of 9

White sugar imports jumped significantly during the December 16th to 31st window when seasonal tariffs were lowered from 45 to 25 percent. According to the Russian State Statistics Committee, total white sugar imports in December 2000 were 136,000 MT, while in November 2000 they totaled only 15,300 MT. Most imports of white sugar came from non-CIS countries.

Table 6: Russian White Sugar Imports, Marketing Years 1999, 2000, and 2001

| 17.01.99 | | 1999 | | 8 | 2000 | | | 2001 | |
|-----------|---------|---------|-------|--------|---------|-------|---------|---------|-------|
| | MT | \$1,000 | Price | MT | \$1,000 | Price | MT | \$1,000 | Price |
| October | 3,259 | 999 | 307 | 4,073 | 1,032 | 253 | 5,418 | 2,039 | 376 |
| November | 13,088 | 4,134 | 316 | 4,634 | 1,171 | 253 | 15,259 | 4,798 | 314 |
| December | 34,000 | 10,000 | 294 | 3,061 | 835 | 273 | 139,115 | 36,878 | 265 |
| Jan.99 | 31,730 | 8,951 | 282 | 2,555 | 639 | 250 | 6,719 | 1,922 | 286 |
| Feb | 23,751 | 6,976 | 294 | 3,967 | 883 | 223 | N.D | N.D. | N.D. |
| March99 | 30,494 | 8,897 | 292 | 10,662 | 2,624 | 246 | N.D | N.D. | N.D. |
| April | 7,390 | 2,341 | 317 | 22,677 | 6,008 | 265 | N.D | N.D. | N.D. |
| May | 6,404 | 1,672 | 261 | 15,349 | 4,003 | 261 | N.D | N.D. | N.D. |
| June | 8,389 | 2,130 | 254 | 8,865 | 2,451 | 276 | N.D | N.D. | N.D. |
| July | 6,930 | 1,986 | 287 | 6,721 | 2,277 | 339 | N.D | N.D. | N.D. |
| August | 3212 | 828 | 258 | 3,408 | 1,192 | 350 | N.D | N.D. | N.D. |
| September | 3498 | 1,018 | 291 | 4,799 | 1,579 | 329 | N.D | N.D. | N.D. |
| Total | 172,145 | 49,932 | 290 | 90,771 | 23,115 | 255 | N.D | N.D. | N.D. |

Source: Russian State Custom Committee

Stocks

Despite the GOR's attempt to regulate the sugar market through an import quota regime and high seasonal tariffs, stocks of raw sugar remain high due to low seasonal demand and a large volume of imports outside of the regime. The GOR is currently considering measures (like further increasing sugar tariffs) which may effectively lower imports and negatively influence stocks during the 2001/2002 marketing year.

GAIN Report #RS1014 Page 8 of 9

Policy

Import Quota

Gain Voluntary Report RS0041 describes Russia's implementation of an import tariff-rate quota regime for sugar. According to a governmental decree, 3.65 million tons of sugar imported from developing countries under the Russian system of preferences will be subject to a 5 percent tariff, while imports above the quota will be assessed a 30 percent duty. In November 2000, import rights were sold through an auction. Lots were sold on a quarterly basis and distributed in 146 allotments of 25,000 MT. (See Gain RS0060).

Table 7: Russia's Tariff Rate Quota Sugar Regime

| Date | Quota in Million MT | Applied Tariff |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| December 16,2000- December 31,2001 | 3.65 Total | 5 percent |
| Quarterly Allotments | | |
| December 16, 200- March 31,2001 | 1.15 | 5 percent |
| April - June, 2000 | 1.5 | 5 percent |
| July - September, 2001 | 0.6 | 5 percent |
| October - December 2001 | 0.4 | 5 percent |

Increase in White Sugar Tariff

According to a representative of Russia's Ministry of Economics, Russia will increase import tariffs on white sugar from 30 percent to 45 percent to protect domestic producers during sugar beet sowing season. A resolution regarding this measure is expected to be signed by the Prime Minister, and will be implemented one month after it is published in the official state newspaper.

Marketing

Prices

High seasonal import tariffs and the high prices for purchasing sugar quota import lots dramatically increased wholesale and retail prices for sugar during the 2000/2001 marketing year. In December 2000, the sugar producer's price was estimated at 10,500 rubles per MT. In comparison, in December 1999, the producer price was only 6,000 rubles per MT. During 2000, the average retail price of sugar rose from about 9 rubles per kilo in January to about 16 rubles per kilo in December (see table 8 below). However, prices are currently falling as a result of large stocks and low seasonal demand for sugar.

GAIN Report #RS1014 Page 9 of 9

Table 8: Average Retail Prices for Food Products in Russia (rubles/kilo) during 2000

| | January | June | September | December |
|-----------------------------------|---------|-------|-----------|----------|
| White Sugar | 9.30 | 12.36 | 14.63 | 15.62 |
| Beef, 1 st grade | 42.16 | 44.97 | 49.20 | 57.72 |
| Chicken | 39.21 | 42.83 | 46.87 | 48.80 |
| Milk, fluid, pasturized, liter | 8.02 | 7.77 | 7.93 | 9.70 |
| Butter | 66.73 | 61.57 | 63.10 | 69.12 |
| Eggs, dozen | 13.86 | 12.37 | 13.23 | 16.57 |

Source: Ekonomika I Zhizn, No. 9, March 2001